

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CARREN RANDELL,

05-CV-1231-AS

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

JO ANNE B. BARNHART,
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

CARREN RANDELL
675 SW Alder Dr.
Dundee, OR 97115

Plaintiff, *Pro Se*

KARIN J. IMMERGUT
United States Attorney
NEIL J. EVANS
Assistant United States Attorney
1000 S.W. Third Avenue, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97204-2902
(503) 727-1053

MICHAEL McGAUGHRAN

Office of the General Counsel

RICHARD RODRIGUEZ

Special Assistant United States Attorney

Social Security Administration

701 5th Avenue, Suite 2900 M/S 901

Seattle, WA 98104-7075

(206) 615-3748

Attorneys for Defendant

BROWN, Judge.

Magistrate Judge Donald C. Ashmanskas issued Findings and Recommendation (#31) on October 5, 2006, in which he recommended the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen the Case (#27) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). Defendant filed a "Response" to the Findings and Recommendation, which the Court construes as an objection. The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). *See also United States v. Bernhardt*, 840 F.2d 1441, 1444 (9th Cir. 1988); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Mach., Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

In her Response, Defendant requested the Court to resolve Defendant's Motion on procedural grounds; specifically, to deny

the Motion on the ground that Plaintiff failed to serve the Motion on Defendant. This Court has carefully considered the substance of Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Case and Defendant's procedural Objections. The Court also has reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo*, and does not find any error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation. The Court concludes the Findings and Recommendation should be affirmed on substantive grounds: *i.e.*, Plaintiff has not produced evidence sufficient to justify vacating the Judgment of Dismissal entered on June 27, 2006.

CONCLUSION

The Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Ashmanskas's Findings and Recommendation (#31) and, accordingly, **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen the Case (#27).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 18th day of December, 2006.

/s/ Anna J. Brown

ANNA J. BROWN
United States District Judge